DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 984 SP 005 382

AUTHOR	Gold, Milton J.
TITLE	Community Participation in Teacher Education: A TTT Innovation. A Survey of Community Participation in Selected TTT (Training of Teachers of Teachers) Projects.
INSTITUTION	City Univ. of New York, N.Y. Hunter Coll.
PUB DATE	Oct 71
NOTE	22p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Community Cooperation; *Community Involvement; *Minority Groups; *Minority Group Teachers; *Teacher Educator Education; *Teacher Educators

ABSTRACT

This paper is based on the author's direct experiences with the Hunter College TTT program, on visits to other TTT projects, and on conversations with personnel participating in them. Projects visited included those at Temple University, University of Chicago, Northwestern University, Washington University in St. Louis, San Fernando State College, San Jose State College, Berkeley Public Schools, the University of Washington, and a meeting of the Southwest cluster. Conversations were held with the project director in most cases and with community representatives, students, teachers, and university faculty where possible. The topics discussed were 1) representation of the community, 2) nature of community participation, 3) experiences in the community for trainees, 4) issues of power and parity, 5) attitudes toward community participation, 6) impact of community participation, and 7) institutionalization of community participation. It appeared that community members have given real assistance in recruiting minority group candidates to teacher education at all levels, have helped orient teacher candidates and faculty members to the community on a personal level, and have shared in setting goals and sometimes in direct instruction. Although the projects have involved friction and trauma, almost all project directors attest to the worth of extended participation. (MBM)

ED 056984

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN TEACHER EDUCATION:

A TTT INNOVATION

A Survey of Community Participation in Selected

TTT (Training of Teachers of Teachers) Projects

Milton J. Gold
Dean of Programs
in Education

Hunter College
October 1971

SP 005382

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN TEACHER EDUCATION:
A TTT INNOVATION

Participation, cooperation, involvement, control, power. Distinctions among these functions and the optimum share of the poverty, minority group community in each of them are focal concerns of a number of TTT projects currently operating in various parts of the country.

The Federally funded Training of Teachers of Teachers program which got under way in the Fall of 1968 stemmed from the proposition that the greatest impact on public education might be secured by centering upon those people who were responsible for training public school administrators and college professors who in turn direct the in-service and pre-service education of teachers. An advisory committee under the leadership of Dr. Donald Bigelow in the U. S. Office of Education helped to establish four regional meetings early in 1969 at each of which approximately 15 university-public school combinations undertook the planning of proposals which would focus on the training of teacher education personnel. The original target population was a trio of public school personnel, liberal arts and teacher education faculties. Growing awareness of the ferment taking place in American cities and on college campuses led to later addition of community representatives and students. Most of the projects which were approved for funding in the Spring of 1969 were pointed at the problems of teacher education for economically disadvantaged groups in urban areas. The guidelines for these programs required the establishment of "parity groups" which connoted participation in project direction of these five groups: public school personnel, liberal arts faculty, teacher education faculty, community members and students.

The City University of New York secured approval for a project comprising four parts, one on each of four college campuses relating to as many local districts within the City School System. The parity principle was employed both

for the central direction of the City University project and on each of the college campuses operating its own part: Hunter College, City College, Richmond College and Brooklyn College. In each case relatively militant members of black and Puerto Rican minorities living in poverty areas were identified as community representatives and teachers in the public schools and college students were sought who represented the same backgrounds. College staff members who were involved in the TTT project represented a full range of ethnic origins, but wherever possible black and Puerto Rican faculty members were recruited to the project.

The writer of this article has been involved in TTT from the early stages of planning, was a member of the group which wrote the original City University proposal, and has been involved in TTT operation both at the University and at the College level. However, the observations in this article stem from his most direct experience which has been with the Hunter College component. Hunter College, like other institutions in TTT, recognized the potential that might be realized if community groups with strong feelings about education could be involved in the redesign of teacher education experiences. In this way, it was felt, a maximum effect would be produced with respect to teacher educators in the college and in cooperating public schools, and ultimately upon the process of education in the schools themselves.

Many of the college personnel started from the orientation that characterized public education in the days of the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools. This orientation took as its assumption public satisfaction with the goals of the schools as they then operated. The citizens committees that were established in the 1950's served chiefly to interpret to the public the goals and programs that the schools were espousing without any large amount of public criticism. The major purpose of these committees was to secure public support

for operations and for school construction where the needs had assumed crisis proportions because of the general failure to erect school buildings during the depression and World War II and because of steeply rising operating costs growing out of the enormous increase in the birth rate following the war.

This "public relations" orientation was desperately out of keeping with the times in 1969. The poverty population among the minority groups was not the enthusiastic supporter of current public school programs that the upper middle class citizens committees proved to be. The militant minority group members had no desire to be used as instruments in order to secure goals that had been set for the educational establishment whether in the public schools or in the universities. They were willing to come into the picture only if they were convinced that their participation would make a real difference in the school programs offered to their children or in programs designed to prepare teachers for their children. Bearing a sense of powerlessness, they were insisting that they have some power to make changes, to select personnel, to control budgets. As a result of many university-sponsored research projects in urban slums, they were no longer willing to have their brains picked for the academic aggrandizement of scholars in the university. They wanted their contribution to be recognized through having a voice in making decisions and through being paid appropriately for services which they were providing. Recognition of the difference between citizens committees in the 1950's and community participation at the present time was in itself an important objective in the training of teachers of teachers in university and public schools.

It should be apparent that this new understanding could not be developed without a certain amount of trauma. Various crises of petty or grand nature arose in the central administration of the project and on each of the campuses. Strong

emotions were expressed. Some individuals found confrontation tactics distasteful and withdrew from participation. Other individuals could not be convinced of the sincerity of the university in these activities, and they withdrew. At Hunter College the five-part parity group at times disintegrated into a division between university personnel on one side, representing the white establishment (although including black faculty members), and non-white public school teachers, community members and students on the other. The first year of the project was one for planning a pilot program involving a score of faculty members, a dozen community representatives and 130 freshmen and juniors. Somehow all of the differences of this planning year were transcended. A viable program was developed, and the first year of its operation was completed successfully in June 1971. Details of this operation will be reported elsewhere. This article addresses itself chiefly to community participation.

The experimental program at Hunter College moved along more quickly because of community participation and community pressure than would otherwise have been the case. The process, however, involved an inordinate amount of emotional energy and personal disturbance. Some of this, perhaps all of it, is inevitable in a learning process that is completely new. In order to find out whether one could accomplish similar results with fewer tribulations, the writer made use of a sabbatical leave in the Spring of 1971 to visit other TTT projects and to speak with personnel participating in them.* The remainder of this article will deal with problems and issues that seem to be common to those projects that had a maximum of community participation, where "community" is defined as non-white populations living at the poverty level.

---

*The writer is grateful to Mrs. Jacqueline G. Wexler, President of Hunter College for granting this leave and for authorizing support for travel performed in conjunction with other college business.

While this study is not sponsored by the TTT Division of the U. S. Office of Education, Dr. Mary Jane Smalley who serves as Director of that program was helpful in identifying projects with a community component. So also were Harry N. Rivlin, Chairman of the TTT Leadership Training Institute and Dorothy M. Fraser who has assisted Dr. Rivlin in this role. Visits were made to projects centered at Temple University, University of Chicago, Northwestern University, Washington University in St. Louis, San Fernando State College, San Jose State College, Berkeley Public Schools, and University of Washington. In addition, Dr. T. N. Tomlinson, Director of the Washington University project, was kind enough to invite the writer to the meeting of the Southwest cluster in March 1971 which focused on community participation. This conference made it possible for the writer to discuss these concerns with representatives of projects at the University of Nebraska, Texas Southern University, University of North Colorado and Southern Illinois University. Conversations were held with the project director in most cases and with community representatives, students, teachers and university faculty where possible.*

It was not possible to visit all of the TTT sites that carried a substantial community proponent. This report accordingly is not a status survey but a summary of impressions from selected sources.

---

*The writer is indebted to the following individuals for their time and the information given to him:

Temple University--Jesse A. Rudnick
University of Chicago--Mrs. Henrietta Schwartz and James McCampbell
Northwestern University--William R. Hazard
San Jose State College--G. W. Ford
San Fernando State College--Delmar T. Oviatt
Washington University--T. N. Tomlinson and George Kraft
University of North Colorado--Harry Waters
Texas Southern University--Ernest B. McGowen
Southern Illinois University--Melvin C. Buller
University of Nebraska--Mr. and Mrs. Levoy De Coteau
University of Washington--Theodore Kaltsounis
Berkeley Public Schools--Richard L. Foster and Nancy Bellard
Washington State Department of Education--William Drummond and Lillian Cady

The substance discussed in interviews is organized in the pages that follow under these headings:

1. Representation of the Community
2. Nature of Community Participation
3. Experiences in the Community for Trainees
4. Issues of Power and Parity
5. Attitudes toward Community Participation
6. Impact of Community Participation
7. Institutionalization of Community Participation

1. Community Representation

Various methods were employed to identify elements of the community that would participate in local projects. The decision was determined by the purpose of each project, by traditions already established in the area and by the contacts of university, public schools and community with each other.

A few projects interpreted community representation to signify recognition of all groups within the service area of the project, including various income levels, ethnic backgrounds and occupational status. A larger number of the project visited interpreted their mission as one directed at poverty level people among the non-white population. Decisions as to recruiting community members were related to the different perspectives.

Having determined which part of the community was to be represented, each project then had to determine its method of securing representation. In the State of Washington applications for funding that were processed through the State Department of Education were required to show the establishment of a consortium made up of three parts: professional associations (both general and specific), higher education (both liberal arts and teacher education) and public schools

(both professionals and the community). Procedures required appointment of members of each team by the responsible head of each of the three groups, thereby negating the possibility of selection of all three components by the project director.

In some of the California projects efforts were made to secure representation of the Anglo, Chicano and black communities. In two cases designation of representatives was sought through election by umbrella groups comprising many organizations in a particular area or composed of a particular ethnic group. These efforts did not always work well and in some cases were changed to selection of community representatives through parent organizations in the schools that participated.

In still other projects community representatives were appointed by the project director, the local superintendent of schools, local principals or other leaders in the school or university position. In some projects efforts were made to identify local activists who had expressed interest in education. These were secured through informal conversations or through contacts with persons in Federally funded poverty programs, in community organizations and with teacher aides.

One of the issues involved was whether community members were representing a constituency and might therefore be presumed to speak for them or whether they community members spoke only for themselves but were invited to participate because of the contribution each might make as an individual and which presumably might represent a point of view of persons of similar background although no effort was made to establish representation in a political sense.

In many cases project personnel reported reluctance of community members to participate. This reluctance might stem from discomfort of individuals in working with an "establishment" which they view negatively, a desire to meet in their own

area rather than always in a university or school situation, but most important a resistance to being used as a rubber stamp. Community representatives, like other members of each team, were insisting that their possible contribution be respected and that they be listened to.

Community members of the various projects also showed a range of militancy, from a bland acceptance of present conditions to a strongly activist point of view demanding immediate change. Some question was raised as to the extent to which the militants represented the community. Large doses of "rhetoric" sometimes alienated professional persons, whether in schools or in universities. Concern was expressed over private axes that militants might have to grind, whether it was community control or black, brown or red power. To balance off these three problems was the assertion in some cases that the quality of militancy produced action not otherwise probable. In one case a project director expressed the feeling that greater efforts should have been made in his area to seek out more militant members.

The resulting community representation in some cases included a broad range of income, educational and racial backgrounds. In general, community members cannot be viewed as representatives in a political sense but must be viewed instead as individuals with a perspective of potential value in restructuring teacher education. The model is one of participatory rather than representative democracy.

2. Nature of Community Participation

Personnel from the community perform a range of functions in TTT projects. In some cases the community members are purely advisory. At times this has produced difficulties as community persons felt that they were not being taken seriously and that they were serving simply as window dressing. In all cases, however, community personnel were also serving as liaison with the community.

Where focus has been on serving minority groups, community members have played an important role in interpreting to the educational establishment in school and university the needs and aspirations of the community. They also have attempted to interpret to the community the purpose of TTT, the university and the schools in the new program and in general. One advisory board has held over 20 community hearings in the past two years. In another case community personnel were important in carrying out a comprehensive survey of parental attitudes towards the school as an institution, teachers and the school program. This survey will constitute the base for school activities organized by TTT in the coming year.

Community representatives in some cases serve as special project personnel on a full-time or part-time basis. In one locale the "community learning facilitator" serves as liaison between the university, public schools and the community. He coordinates TTT activities in the classroom but enters the classroom only as an observer, recognizing a difference in function between the teacher and himself. The facilitator in this case as in others recognizes one of his functions as helping teachers, TTT trainees and college personnel to understand children from minority backgrounds and the environments from which they come. In another project community liaison people give four hours of voluntary work each week.

Some institutions use community personnel for direct instruction in college classrooms. They have served as librarians, resource speakers for classes, assistant instructors and counselors although their educational backgrounds may vary all the way from simple completion of grammar school through the possession of graduate degrees. Because of the backgrounds of students in TTT projects, at times students serve as the community representatives and play an important role as liaison among public school personnel to the TTT representatives, students in the classroom and parents. In many cases community personnel plan the field

experiences for TTT trainees, for the college students, new teachers or college faculty. Their background is diverse, some of them having been recruited from poverty agencies themselves, some of them having important positions in welfare rights organizations, social work and business. Their most common function in instruction is providing community orientation in the early stage of the training of TTT candidates.

In at least two institutions community personnel are given control of a budget financing TTT operations in their community. In most cases budgetary participation has been through membership on the parity committee in each project which passes on the budget normally initiated by the project director. In some cases community personnel have expressed strong feelings concerning participation in budget making and in the hiring and firing of personnel since they regard these two functions as the most symbolic of power or powerlessness.

Community personnel share in most projects in selection of TTT candidates. In some cases these are young people in public schools who are being prepared through advanced work in colleges for leadership positions. In other cases they are doctoral candidates without the prior designation by a public school system of possible leadership appointments. In still other cases community personnel have helped to identify minority group students for pre-service teacher education programs that are serving as pilot projects in TTT locations.

In one case community personnel saw themselves as involved in state-wide political processes that involved both the public schools and the universities. They are represented on various local and state-wide groups. They express the feeling that they have had major influence upon the state university but are less confident of their effect upon the public schools.

Reimbursement of community personnel varies with the nature of the activity

and the community. In some cases the only reimbursement is expenses to cover travel, baby sitting and the like. In other cases professional salaries are paid for professional services. In between there is a range of reimbursement which parallels teacher aide salaries in the schools available for similar services and to persons with similar backgrounds. In some cases community personnel have been paid hourly stipends for participating in planning sessions in the first stage of the project. In practically every case some full-time persons are recruited from the community to coordinate activities.

Finally there are cases where community participation is only minimal. Addition of the community component after most projects had been designed resulted in a wide range of community participation, all the way from intensive involvement to the most superficial kind of tokenism. One of the widest types of participation has been sharing in the planning of programs. In most cases TTT projects had a substantial amount of start-up time. Generally all members of the parity pentagon shared in the design of programs that college students, graduate students, public school personnel and college faculty would undertake in subsequent time periods.

3. Experiences in the Community for Trainees

Community participation in organizing experiences for trainees has reflected the nature of each TTT project. In some cases activities have been organized for undergraduates who have served in pilot programs whose planning and operation represent TTT training for university, public school and community personnel. In other cases activities have been arranged directly for graduate students, school teachers and administrators and college faculty.

The most common type of community experience has been visits to homes of children and to agencies in poverty areas. Agencies have included such institutions as health offices, hospitals, newspapers, welfare offices, youth service

centers, day care centers, anti-poverty offices, ethnic organizations, activist groups, store fronts and the like. Visits to homes have had varying reactions. In one case the project director felt the most useful device was to hold organized meetings of a small group of parents in one home to discuss school offerings and problems. To these meetings a number of TTT trainees would be invited, but they would always be kept in the minority in order to make sure that the persons being visited would feel free to express themselves in a meeting that was truly their own.

Other community experiences have included the following:

Organizing an after-school learning center for children

Offering classes in English for speakers of Spanish

Organizing classes to help adults secure high school equivalency diplomas

Offering classes for children in dramatics and Afro-American dance

Helping interested families in planning budgets

Participating in community councils

Working in community service organizations such as the Urban League, YMCA, mental health centers, Department of Human Resources

Developing materials on black studies for use in secondary schools

Organizing a Fifth of May celebration in a Mexican-American school

Organizing class libraries

Working to improve public library services for children

In general TTT trainees were positive about their community contacts. In some cases they felt that the contacts were inadequate or artificial. For the most part they recognized the role played by community representatives in establishing community contacts which was beyond the scope of most university faculty.

4. Issues of Power and Parity

In practically every TTT project sharing authority with community members represented a new experience for all members of the team. As such it was inevitable that misunderstandings should arise and that mutual suspicions be raised.

One of the problems was the fairly common one that arose from failure to distinguish between the functions of a policy board and those of the project administration. Since this is such a common problem among boards of education throughout the country, it was not surprising that community members with little experience of this kind should also find need to define their roles as members of policy boards.

A second problem arose because individuals who approached the situation with a deep-seated feeling of powerlessness vis-a-vis educational structures tended to misconstrue any actions that were taken despite their expression of disagreement. As some project directors expressed it, parity meant full control to these individuals. The question of the proportion of representation was also prominent and in 1969-70 it was aggravated by the fact that TTT projects were being organized at the same time that students were demanding 50 per cent participation in all committees on certain campuses. In these cases it was difficult to get students to understand that they were only one part of a five-way team.

Although the motto of one parity team was Arriba Juntos ("forward together"), it was apparent that different kinds of divisions took place in different locations. In some cases it was students versus adults. In others it was white versus non-white, or black versus Puerto Rican, or black versus Chicanos where more than one minority group was involved. These divisions reflect profound conflicts in the local culture and are not easily resolved.

The most important problem in the more sophisticated areas was definition of the status of community representatives. Community members had to be reassured

that this was not still another university project which sought to "pick the brains" of local poor people and to withdraw without improving life in the slums in any way. Community representatives stressed the need to respect the dignity of their constituents, of making them feel that they are persons whom the educational establishment is willing to listen to seriously. One community learning facilitator set forth the following requirements for smoothly working community involvement:

1. The community vanguard is familiar with how schools work.
2. Community grievances can be adequately channeled and met with meaningful administrative response.
3. Community people must always feel free to criticize (constructive or otherwise) and suggest, question and receive answers of the school community.
4. Community people not in the vanguard must always be allowed ample time to thoroughly familiarize themselves with the school community.

Power issues arose in a few cases where personnel decisions were made by university personnel without consulting the community or where the community was agitating for personnel action in the public schools which TTT personnel were reluctant to support.

One of the minor issues that apparently occasioned strong feelings was the question of the willingness of professional personnel actually to involve themselves in the community. This was expressed through the failure of some projects to conduct most of their business in the poverty community, and their failure to show up at special events, such as art exhibits held in the community. Here may be found an interesting parallel to school bussing which moves only in one direction.

5. Attitudes toward Community Participation

Community attitudes toward TTT projects reflect the power issue which has already been discussed. Except for those cases where there is a history of university involvement in the community there is strong skepticism concerning the university's willingness to share any of its control for teacher education programs or even of a specific project like TTT. The fact that the parity principle was introduced after projects had already been funded is evidence of the recency of new attitudes at the national as well as the local level.

Community representatives counsel school and university personnel not to attempt to "sell" programs to the community. They advise TTT members to go into the community and develop faith in the program and institutions they represent in order to secure help in developing new programs. They insist on the need to convince people that TTT really seeks genuine change. This can be done only if the community feels that the program is theirs and not one that is imposed from outside. The greatest satisfaction was expressed by those institutions that have had a history of working with their communities.

Suspicions were expressed of various kinds, some of them interracial, some of them with respect to relationships among the five parity components--academic faculty, teacher education faculty, community, public schools, students. One TTT candidate described the team arrangement as a "marriage of convenience," a loose arrangement in which the five components were living together each to secure its own needs.

On the other hand many community personnel expressed quite positively their feeling toward new arrangements and their sense that community participation was here to stay. The greatest gap has been between the university and the community, and even in the case of those universities that serve a national rather than a

local community, there is hope that intertwining of the two will continue. Relationships of school and university are also much involved since an indirect effect of TTT is to change programs and training of personnel for the schools. In a few instances the university has had to walk a tight rope because community members wanted to enlist their support in securing changes of leadership personnel in the school. In one case a sympathetic school superintendent raised the issue of commitments being made by university people to the community which left the public schools responsible to carry out a commitment on which they had not been consulted.

Public school personnel shared with the community negative attitudes toward university projects which were perceived as temporary displays of interest. Public school leaders were in a sense expressing the same objection as community people for being used and for having their brains picked for the purposes of outsiders.

One superintendent summed up the situation beautifully when he said that programs in the community had shown "if you do not train these people and work together collaboratively you set up all those bifurcations that can go on in a school district."

Student reaction included a desire for more participation and less observation of the community. They recognized that community members could arrange experiences for them in a way that university personnel could not.

Many faculty members found initially working with militant community members difficult. In most situations there was an almost inevitable use of rhetoric with respect to schools, universities and the white professional establishment that deeply disturbed faculty members who had not previously encountered this rhetoric personally. Some faculty members used this experience to heighten their own sensitivity to the problems that underlay the rhetoric even though they might discount the more flamboyant parts of it. Others were totally alienated and withdrew from the project.

One of the persistent problems was the question as to the role of community persons in professional decisions on teacher education. One project director declared flatly that teacher education is a technical process and that community members have no part in decisions or operations requiring professional experience and competence. In other projects community personnel were invited to share in discussions and to learn as they went along. As a result one could hear community support for modern procedures that have been in effect for a score of years as if the device had been newly established. In such cases professional personnel were pleased because they saw the community representative as a liaison with the community in developing better understanding of school programs or of teacher education procedures.

In many cases community personnel indicated impatience with the teacher education objectives of TTT since they were more concerned with what was immediately happening to their own children in the schools. For this reason community members tended to show greater interest in the kind of TTT program which approached the training of teachers through innovative practice in pilot school situations.

In some projects directors who were themselves white raised the question of white directorship for projects that centered on non-white populations. There was a range of attitudes from a strong insistence on recruiting a non-white director to negative feelings with respect to race identification. In general, a serious effort was made to recruit a large proportion of non-white faculty and non-white trainees in those projects which were oriented toward black, Puerto Rican or Mexican-American populations.

6. Impact of Community Participation

Most important is some evaluation of the impact that community participation may have on TTT. In those cases where community participation has been genuine

both community and professional personnel are in agreement that there has been a substantial effect upon training programs.

Most frequently mentioned is direct involvement in the community of teacher and administrator candidates than has been true of programs in the past. These have ranged from observation to genuine participation, with some specific experiences being mentioned in section 3 above. This extension of meaningful field experiences would not have been possible without the utilization of community personnel and their identification with the poverty or minority community which is often skeptical about the white professional middle class. In some cases this is bringing teacher candidates into the inner city in their very first term in college. College instructors accompanying their students undertake their own TTT training. In others doctoral candidates are securing an introduction to the inner city, one which previously has not been available in advanced programs.

Community members in some cases expressed the feeling that the top administration in the university with which they were working had now made commitments for service to the inner city which had not existed previously. They were now more positive about the attitude of the university toward the city in which it was located.

Recruitment of minority group students at the pre-service and at the graduate level has also been an important contribution of work with minority community members. This is also reflected in a larger representation than normal of minority faculty in TTT.

Community representatives indicate greater support of good teaching methods because of their participation. They show appreciation for new understanding of educational changes. In addition they expressed the feeling that public school programs are changing as a result of experimental TTT work. Feeling was expressed

on many sites that there is a growing acceptance of the concept that school and community are interrelated rather than separate.

In all cases involvement of community members is regarded as facilitating and hastening change at the level of teacher training. It is difficult to determine how much of this change reflects willingness to move on experimental programs in unorthodox ways and how much is the result of a sense of community pressure.

7. Institutionalization

Will community participation continue when TTT goes the way of all projects? TTT was initially announced for a limited period, and while extensions have been made, it is reasonable to expect that at sometime it will cease to be. The question of institutionalization was therefore raised with project directors.

In some cases directors indicated that the utilization of community personnel had not occasioned serious additional costs to the university and that a budget problem was not involved. They felt that the principle of community involvement had been established and it would continue. In other cases a cost factor for coordinators or consultants was identified and willingness of the college to accept this responsibility varied. In still other cases the function was seen as a public school responsibility and some public schools saw enough value in community coordination affecting teacher training to underwrite the costs themselves.

Directors of advanced programs that had initiated community experience indicated their belief that the value had been demonstrated and that community participation would continue.

There was general acceptance of the value of community representation on committees setting policy for field experiences. In some institutions this is likely to be broadened to community representation on over-all policy committees for the School of Education.

Specific programs in some cases have grown out of TTT and are likely to be continued. These include at one institution the development of a bilingual student teaching program and a Chicano track as a major for teacher candidates.

At any rate the effect of the experience upon faculty members who have participated is obviously a permanent part of the experience of these faculty members. There is likely to be a multiplier effect as they work with other colleagues.

Summary

TTT requirement of community participation in funded projects has added a new dimension to the structure of teacher education in most TTT sites or strengthened such involvement where it was already present. The innovation has carried with it its own varieties of birth pangs and after-birth trauma. Almost unanimously, project directors attest to the worth of extended participation despite problems encountered along the way.

Community participation introduces to college and school affairs a greater awareness of community problems and crises and heightens the consciousness thereof among planning and operating personnel in the profession. To the community it gives a greater sense of sharing in decision making that affects their children, and at best a new sense of genuine participation in the mainstream of a given city or region.

In more specific terms, community members have given real assistance in recruiting minority group candidates to teacher education at all levels involved in TTT. They have helped to orient teacher candidates and current faculty members to the community on a personal level not otherwise feasible. They have shared in setting goals and sometimes in direct instruction. They have served as a ferment for change in undergraduate, graduate and in-service programs that has accelerated development of new programs.

These positive features do not gainsay the existence of various frictions. Some of these simply characterize most innovations. Others reflect deep-seated attitudes, problems and conditions in the community--prejudice, mistrust, the effects of poverty. Public schools and colleges will not eradicate these conditions by themselves, but community participation in educational affairs can increase both awareness and response. The immediate result is one also of increased discomfort, but perhaps this is the best route toward achieving a genuine concern that will lead to action at the level of each individual's power and responsibility.

ve